Hemispheric Warnings to JFK on Cuba, P. 4

Stevenson at the UN On China: How to Destroy A Great American Asset By Stultification, See Page Two

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 46 DECEMBER 11, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Menace Is on the Right But the Crackdown Is on the Left

Looked at from abroad, the leading nation of the free world must cut a silly figure with the indictments the government has just obtained against the Communist Party. At a time when right-wing crackpot organizations are more numerous than they have been since the pre-war Hitler period, and a time when the Communist Party has never been weaker and less influential, the government suddenly launches a large-scale legal attack upon it. Though these right wing organizations are serious enough to draw fire from Kennedy and Eisenhower, Johnson and Nixon, and though they reach thousands with propaganda subverting confidence in the government and democratic institutions, the registration statute the government has now set out to enforce would not have the slightest effect on any of them. Even if it were proven that a right wing organization were linked with some government or movement abroad, seeking—as the Nazi and Fascist regimes sought before the war—to undermine American freedoms, the statute would not affect them. It applies only to Communist movements. Its impact is only on the Left.

The Handiwork of Extremists

This is not at all surprising. For this Act was the product of an earlier and similar wave of extremism. Indeed two public figures now warning against the dangers of right wing extremism, former Vice President Nixon and President Kennedy, share responsibility for the Act, the former as an active sponsor of its debut in 1948 as the Mundt-Nixon bill, the latter as one of the Democrats who voted to override President Truman's veto of the bill in 1950. Few remember that distinguished lawyers as conservative as the late John W. Davis attacked this registration statute as unconstitutional after its first emergence in 1948 from the House Un-American Activities Committee. Few people abroad are aware that the government has been forced to act under this statute now because the Supreme Court earlier this year, after a decade of litigation, finally upheld the registration provisions. But few Americans will realize these are the product of a mentality much like that of the John Birch Society. Great conservative papers like the *New York Times* deride the Birch Society for proposing to compile a roster of "comsymps", supposed sympathizers with Communism, but few notice that this Act would have the government draw up much the same kind of list. The registration provisions of the Act seek to force the registration of Communist "action", "front", or "infiltrated" organizations based upon their supposed degree of sympathy with or control by Communists. The Act sets up a Subversive Activities Control Board to measure the extent to which any organization's views parallel those of the Communist movement. The preconceptions are like those of the racist crackpots who see Communism on the Supreme Court because Communists also oppose racial segregation.

The Attorney General was badly advised when he issued his statement saying that the Communists were not being outlawed, that they were merely being asked to register, as others are required to register, in the sale of securities, in the establishment of welfare and pension funds, in acting as lawyers or other types of agents for foreign governments. None of these registrations expose the registrant to public obloquy and to the threat of criminal prosecution. None deny him the right to a passport or to a government job nor force him to put the yellow badge on his publications or broadcasts by affixing to them so invidious a label as "communistic."

Should extremist right wingers ever come to power, this Act and the Subversive Activities Control Board it established, would provide the framework for a Fascist regime, permitting it to purge, blacklist and ostracize liberals and moderates of all kinds by showing that some of their views paralleled those of the Communist Party. The one hope is that the penalties attached to being a Communist are so onerous that the Supreme Court, we feel certain, will in effect throw the Act out as a violation of the Fifth amendment when the government actually tries to jail anyone under it for failure to register.

One Way to Reduce Taxes

Some interesting arithmetic is invited by the Internal Security Act under which the Communist Party has just been indicted for failure to register. The maximum penalty is 5 years in jail and a $10,000 fine for each day of failure to register. Thus the sentence theoretically possible for one year's failure to register is 1,825 years in jail. Even with a few centuries knocked off for good behavior, Communists should seem less menacing by then.

The fines open entrancing vistas for the U.S. Treasury. The fine for each day's failure to register is $10,000. In 365 days (no allowance is made for Sundays or holidays since Communists are legally presumed to be atheists), every Communist who fails to register would be subject to a fine of $3,650,000. The Department of Justice estimates, perhaps too hopefully, that there are still about 10,000 Communists left in this country. If all of them fail to register for one year, the fines which could be imposed on them would total $36,500,000,000, enough to meet almost half the annual Federal budget.

It would seem that if only our Communists stand firm and refuse to register, and Moscow loyally keeps them supplied with gold from the Urals and Vorkuta with which to pay their fines, the rest of us could enjoy a sizeable tax reduction.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Time for Adlai Stevenson to Get Off Kennedy's Team Before He's Ruined Morally

A U.S. Asset Being Destroyed to Give Stale Policy A New Mouthpiece

The sooner Adlai Stevenson resigns from his post at the UN and gets off the Kennedy team the better for him and the country. He belongs in the opposition, where he can bring pressure on the President from the side of those who want peace and sanity in the world. It was a painful experience to sit in the UN General Assembly the opening day of the debate on admission of China and hear Mr. Stevenson forced to recite that stale rehash of hate, inertia and political cowardice which has constituted our China policy since the Korean war and McCarthy's attacks on Acheson. These led Harry Truman to relinquish his hands-off policy toward the Chinese civil war and extend an American protectorate over Chiang Kai-shek's hated and defeated plunderbund in their last refuge on Formosa.

The U.S. Shares Formosa's Bondage

Since then the shrewd, crafty and unscrupulous men around Chiang have succeeded in becoming a major and poisonous force in American politics. Sometimes one feels like exclaiming in despair that it is not the Formosans who need a plebiscite to get rid of the Kuomintang but we. Through McCarthy and McCarran they purged the State Department of men who would not do Chiang's bidding; even today their brain-washing operation has left behind monstrous monuments. An ex Left Socialist, still a liberal in domestic policy, Douglas of Illinois, has become the mainstay of Chiang in the U.S. Senate. Now Stevenson, asked to run for the Senate from Illinois, too, is compelled first to get up and make a speech which runs counter to all he has stood and fought for. Between his stand on China policy and his errand boy missions in Latin America to prepare the way for a new hemispheric assault on Castro, Stevenson has slowly been committing moral suicide. A great American asset, an American who symbolized for millions around the world the better, wiser, more liberal America, this asset is being destroyed because Kennedy lacks what it takes to change China policy from what it was under Eisenhower.

The most ignominous moment of that ignominous spectacle the day debate opened came when Mr. Stevenson accused China of training a half dozen Cameroonians for sabotage operations in their native African country. Mr. Zorin then reminded Mr. Stevenson that the U.S. had trained and sent far more men into Cuba on a similar mission last spring, yet no one argued that the United States should be excluded from the United Nations. The Cameroonian delegate himself objected to having his country used by the U.S. in its cold war battle with China.

Never has propaganda so blinded a free people as we have been blinded in our relations with China. It is we, not the Chinese who have our bases thousands of miles from home across the Pacific. It is *our* Navy and *our* Air Force which patrol straits as close to China and as much a part of China as Long Island Sound is part of the United States. It is China which has on at least three occasions in recent years offered to make her Pacific shores an atom free zone, and it is we who have rudely rejected those offers without consideration and put nuclear bases around China's periphery. Whatever the outcome of this year's debate, it will be marked even among those who vote on our side with a further decline in respect for our politics and our political leaders.

Just Two Years Ago

"On the Communist side, the concessions would include the extension to China of any system of international inspection of disarmament, ending the threat of force against Formosa and subversion in Indochina, a peaceful frontier settlement with India, free elections under UN supervision in Korea, and acceptance of the right of the inhabitants of Formosa to determine their own destiny by plebiscite supervised by the UN. On our side, concessions would presumably include an end to the American embargo on China's admission to the United Nations (not to be confused with diplomatic recognition), the evacuation of Quemoy and Matsu and the inclusion of Korea and Japan in the atom-free zone and area of controlled disarmament.

"Perhaps neither the Russians nor we ourselves are yet prepared to talk in such concrete terms. Yet it is clear that no general control of disarmament has any value unless it includes China, and it is difficult to see how China can accept international control when it is not, formally, a member of international society. Moreover, as a member of the UN, Communist China, with a quarter of the world's population, would be more accountable to world opinion than as an outcast."

—Adlai Stevenson in Foreign Affairs, Jan. 1960

Cambodia Says UN Cannot Solve Major World Problems Without China's Participation

"Let us take for example the question of disarmament. Who can deny that any agreement on disarmament—assuming that one can be concluded—would be considerably weakened, if not rendered largely ineffective, if the Peoples Republic of China, with all its enormous uncontrolled military potential were not party to the agreement? . . .

"A second example: according to the opinion of competent circles China will soon be capable of making atom bombs. What purpose would be served by an accord on nuclear armament if this did not include China? . . .

"In 1954, when the so-called Indochinese war attained its culminating point, with the Vietminh forces on the point of turning the tide in their favor, an international conference was hastily convoked to find a solution to put an end to the war. . . . China came to this conference and participated in full equality. . . .

"Again in May 1961, when the Laotian conflict threatened to develop into a large general conflict, then on the initiative of our Chief of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, a new enlarged Geneva conference was convoked, this time including 14 States among which was the Peoples Republic of China . . .

"Why was it judged necessary to invite Peoples China to these conferences? Very simply because it was thought—with good reason—that no decision could be taken on these questions without the agreement of China. . . . We do not understand why these same great powers are opposed to the presence of China in our Assembly when the United Nations are confronted with problems even more important?"

—M. Tioulong of Cambodia, UN General Assembly Dec. 1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UN Vote for Swedish Resolution A Defeat for U.S. Policy and West German Ambition

Canada, Norway, Denmark Split NATO Bloc to Vote for "Non Nuclear" Club

The U.S. press has failed to cover at all adequately the full significance of the vote by which the United Nations, sitting in First Committee, overwhelmingly endorsed the Swedish resolution on Nov. 30. This looks toward the establishment of a "non-nuclear club" and a series of atom free zones around the world. The vote must be seen against the background of the Kennedy-Adenauer talks and the West German campaign to take control of NATO's nuclear warheads from the sole jurisdiction of the U.S. president, and give Bonn a finger on the trigger. While Adenauer did not succeed in winning Kennedy's approval for this, he did succeed in blocking inclusion in Berlin negotiations of any proposal for an atom free zone in Central Europe.

A Vote of Non-Confidence in Bonn

Both these objectives of German policy would be thwarted by the Swedish resolution. It seeks to set up a "club" for nations pledged not to produce nuclear weapons, not to acquire them, and not to allow them to be stored on their soil. Were these aims fully achieved, they would not only end Germany's hopes of acquiring nuclear weapons on its own and preventing an atom free zone in Central Europe but would also force a change in U.S. policy toward NATO. The U.S. would no longer be able to store nuclear warheads on the soil of non-nuclear NATO members as it is now doing, and consequently be unable to train them in their use in the event of war. This is what the U.S. meant when it complained that the resolution threatened existing defense arrangements.

The U.S. representative, Mr. Yost, argued that the Swedish resolution "calls into question the right of free nations to join together in collective self-defense, including the right of self-defense with nuclear weapons if need be." This pompous sophistry and U.S. pressure were unable, however, even to hold NATO's own ranks together. Canada, Norway and Denmark voted for the resolution. The U.S. was only able to marshal 12 votes including its own against it. These were the votes of the remaining NATO powers plus Spain and Portugal, and Nicaragua the only Latin American country to vote with us against the "non-nuclear club" idea. All the Scandinavian powers voted for it; so did Brazil and Mexico. From Asia even the votes of generally pro-Western Thailand, Pakistan and Israel were cast for the resolution. Not a single African vote could be obtained against it. Even Nationalist China, South Africa and U.S. satellites as small as Guatemala and El Salvador could not be prevailed upon to do more than abstain. The final vote was 57 to 12, with 32 abstentions.

The Swedish resolution is only a weak first step but it can be used to set forces into motion. Under it the Acting UN Secretary General is instructed to poll the non-nuclear powers and ask them whether and under what conditions they would be willing to enter into undertakings not to produce, acquire or store nuclear weapons. He is to report the results not later than April 1. The peace movement abroad should be alerted to the significance of the vote, and begin to arouse public opinion to shape the outcome. This could be turned into a kind of world-wide plebiscite on whether the peoples of the earth want nuclear weapons to spread any further. It would also give the smaller powers a chance to get around the stalemate between the big, and initiate action on their own. Particularly among Germany's smaller neighbors, the coming UN poll provides an opportunity to speak up against West Germany's ambition to become a thermonuclear power.

Bonn Accuses Shirer of Bias

"Bonn—The West German government has adopted the unusual expedient of attacking William Shirer's best-selling 'Rise and Fall of the Third Reich' in an official Bonn publication. The occasion for the action has been the appearance of Mr. Shirer's account of Nazism in a German language edition. . . .

"The German government has been dismayed at the success which the book has enjoyed in the U.S. They regard it as having played an important role in keeping unpleasant memories of the past alive among the American public. The government publication lodged a charge of anti-German bias against Mr. Shirer."

—Gaston Coblenz dispatch from Bonn in the New York Herald-Tribune Sunday, Dec. 3.

Kennedy's Position on Berlin Talks Contrasted With West Germany's

"To compare what President Kennedy said to Mr. Adzhubei with the West German Government's statement to the Bundestag yesterday is not altogether fair. . . . Still, the statements appeared almost simultaneously and covered some of the same subjects. Something is therefore to be gained by setting them side by side.

"The most conspicuous difference is in the tone of voice. President Kennedy was firm on specific points. He emphasized his determination to defend western rights in Berlin, and his belief in the need to reunify Germany. But he sought what common ground he could between the American and Russian points of view. This spirit seems lacking from the German statement, which emphasizes maximum demands and minimum concessions. . . . It rejects any regional measures against surprise attack and any advance settlement of frontier problems. On foreign aid it even goes as far as to state, 'The German people would not understand if we were to enter into development partnerships with states that do not recognize our rights of self-determination.'

"On specific points there is a difference of emphasis—which conceals a basic disagreement—on the role of nuclear weapons in Europe. The German Government renewed its demand that NATO should become an atomic force. Apart from the fact that the present arrangement does not appear to put the western forces at a disadvantage, the idea of decentralizing control of nuclear weapons runs directly counter to present efforts to prevent their spread and to raise the threshold of catastrophe by building up conventional forces. President Kennedy appears to share this latter view. . . .

"There is also a basic but vaguer difference. The German statement repeats that European security can be discussed only in connection with reunification. President Kennedy explicitly recognizes that reunification is out of the question for the moment, and holds out hopes that if the Berlin question can be settled 'we can, in my opinion, reach a peaceful settlement in the centre of Europe'."

—Editorial leader in The Times (London) Nov. 30

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Way to Earn Latin American Respect Is to Leave Castro Alone

Hemisphere Already Split by JFK's New Moves Against Cuba

The meeting of the Organization of American States here in Washington last Monday should be a warning to the Kennedy Administration that it is playing with dynamite in its efforts to prepare for new action against Cuba. Though it won agreement to a meeting in Panama Jan. 10, it did so at the expense of a hemispheric split. Despite Castro's declaration of Marxism-Leninism, its scare treatment in the U.S. press and the exertion of strong pressure over the week-end, the U.S. was unable to carry most of the hemisphere with it.

The vote was 14 to 2, with five abstentions, but the negative vote of Mexico (the other was Cuba's) and the abstentions of Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile and Ecuador meant that the larger nations with roughly four-fifths of the population and area of Latin America did not vote with us.

Odd Companions on The New Frontier

Those who lined up on our side included some peculiar recruits for a new crusade to make the hemisphere safe for democracy: The dictator Somozas of Nicaragua, the dictator Stroessner of Paraguay, the dictator Duvalier of Haiti, Ydigoras of Guatemala, the military junta of El Salvador, the oligarchies of Panama and Peru, and Trujillo's final gift to the Dominican people, Balaguer.

It is feared that the Panama meeting has two purposes. One is to create an atmosphere in which a new armed attack on Cuba can be carried out. The Cubans claim that men are again being trained in Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Puerto Rico for invasion. The *New York Post* Nov. 21 carried a *Chicago Daily News* dispatch by Gerry Robichaud from Guatemala City declaring that Pedraza, Batista's most hated aide, notorious for the torture chambers over which he presided, is training an invasion group in Guatemala.

The other feared purpose of the Panama meeting is again to set up as in the early 50's a political committee as a cover for a hemispheric FBI operation. It is notorious that many men now prominent in the more democratic regimes which have replaced many of the military dictatorships were then blacklisted as "subversive" and denied the right to travel.

Two Versions, One From Miami The Other From Havana

"Miami, Dec. 2—(UPI)—Cuban Premier Fidel Castro said today he really has been a dedicated Communist since his college days but he concealed his views so it would be easier to seize power."

—Washington Daily News, Dec. 2, under banner headlines covering most of page one, "Castro Says He Was Red Right From The Start."

"Havana, Dec. 2—(AP)—Declaring he is a Marxist-Leninist opposed to the personality cult, Fidel Castro said today, 'The world is on the road toward Communism' and he is taking Cuba down that path. . . . In his latest address, Mr. Castro said that during his years as a student at Havana University he was not a Marxist because he was 'influenced by imperialist and reactionary propaganda against the Communists.'

"By 1953, three years before his invasion of Cuba, his political thinking 'was more or less like what it is now', he added, but it was only after he came to power that he developed into a Marxist-Leninist."

—Washington Sunday Star, Dec. 3.

Latin Americans fear a recurrence of this on the excuse of hunting down Castro agents.

The way to earn the respect of the hemisphere is to let Cuba alone. The way to tear the hemisphere apart and ruin the prospects of the Alliance for Progress is to make it seem only an elaborate bribe for a mass onslaught on the first leader in a generation to give Latin Americans genuine social and economic reform. Many leaders who take an astringent view of Castro, and do not wish at all to be beholden to Moscow, will rally to his side if we attack him. So will the Latin American masses. Castro was Kennedy's first big mistake. He will regret it if he tries a repeat performance.

In a burst of Birchism, the Commodore Hotel in New York cancelled a memorial meeting to have been held there last Tuesday for John T. McManus, general manager of the National Guardian, and a Bill of Rights dinner scheduled for next Friday, Dec. 15, by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee with Carey McWilliams of The Nation and I. F. Stone as speakers.

We'll Send Free Sample Copies of This to Friends If You Send Stamped Self-Addressed LONG Envelopes

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

12/11/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED